UNITED NATIONS

DIVISION FOR
PALESTINIAN RIGHTS

TWENTY-SEVENTH UNITED NATIONS REGIONAL SEMINAR
ON THE QUESTION OF PALESTINE
(SEVENTH NORTH AMERICAN REGIONAL SEMINAR)

Theme: "Peace and justice for the Palestinian people - an imperative for the 1990s"

United Nations Headquarters, New York
25-26 June 1990

90-19355

best copy available

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Page
Introduction	1- 3	1
A. Opening statements	4-18	1
B. Panel discussion	19-34	6
C. Conclusions and recommendations	35-44	14

Annexes

I.	Message from the participants to H.E. Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization	18
II.	List of participants	19

Introduction

1. The Seventh United Nations North American Regional Seminar on the Question of Palestine on the general theme "Peace and justice for the Palestinian people - an imperative for the 1990s" was held at United Nations Headquarters, New York, on 25 and 26 June 1990. The Seminar had been mandated by General Assembly resolution 44/41 B of 6 December 1989.

2. Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo (Senegal), Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People was Chairman and Mr. Alexander Borg Olivier, Rapporteur of the Committee, was Rapporteur of the Seminar.

3. Four meetings were held and 12 panelists presented papers on selected aspects of the question of Palestine. In addition, representatives of 47 Governments, Palestine, 1 non-member State, 2 United Nations organs, 7 United Nations specialized agencies and bodies, three intergovernmental organizations, as well as 1 national liberation movement and 15 non-governmental organizations attended the Seminar.

A. Opening statements

Statement by the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations

4. The opening session was addressed by the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Under-Secretary-General Ronald I. Spiers. In welcoming the participants, Mr. Spiers stressed that the decision of the General Assembly to convene regional seminars on the question of Palestine reflected the international community's deep concern about the Arab-Israeli conflict, which the problem of Palestine intensified. There was overwhelming agreement among the members of the United Nations that a just and equitable solution of the issue, which affected not only the parties directly concerned but also the international community as a whole, was more urgent than ever.

5. He referred to the European Regional Seminar on the Question of Palestine, which had been held in Stockholm, Sweden, in May and said that it had been particularly successful because of the participation of parliamentarians and opinion-makers from Europe, Israeli and Palestinian panelists as well as experts from the United States, China, the Soviet Union and representatives of the International and European Co-ordinating Committees for NGOs. The valuable contributions of all the participants had led to a lively and constructive discussion and the deliberations had been marked by a co-operative spirit which had resulted in positive and pragmatic proposals for the future.

6. He emphasized that the meeting was taking place at a time when a political deadlock combined with the existing diplomatic vacuum could, if it continued, have very serious implications. The international community was increasingly concerned at the deteriorating situation in the occupied territories. The uprising, the intifadah, was now in its third year. The message of the intifadah was direct and unequivocal. The Israeli occupation, which had now lasted for 23 years, had not become acceptable to the Palestinian people. In that atmosphere, it seemed imperative that a way must be found to begin an effective negotiating process that could restore hope for the attainment of a just and durable peace.

7. The General Assembly, at its forty-fourth session, had overwhelmingly adopted a resolution which called once again for the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East. That Conference, to be held under the auspices of the United Nations, would bring together parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, and the five permanent members of the Security Council. In the view of the Secretary-General, it should meet on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and take fully into account the legitimate political rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination.

8. The progress towards a settlement in the Middle East appeared to be stalled for the moment, and there had been acts of violence against innocent civilians which the Secretary-General had condemned and which had been the subject of lengthy discussion in the Security Council. The Secretary-General had called on the Israeli authorities, as the occupying Power, to abide scrupulously by their obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention. Further, the Secretary-General had been deeply concerned about developments in the territories. He had felt that in view of his responsibilities under the Charter it was his duty to send a mission to look into the situation and report back to him.

9. The lack of progress towards peace, which could only be achieved through effective negotiations, had deepened the frustration of the peoples of the Middle East, contributing to an escalation of tension throughout the area. The Secretary-General felt it was imperative that a negotiating process involving all the parties to the conflict be launched as soon as possible. For that reason, the Secretary-General had maintained constant contact with all the parties to the Middle East conflict with a view towards trying to establish some common basis for negotiations. Many Governments were continuing their efforts to assist the parties in the Middle East towards a settlement. Such efforts must continue, in spite of discouraging developments. In that context, he noted that the United States Government had, for the present, suspended its dialogue with the Palestine Liberation Organization. While the decisions of Governments had to be respected, it had to be emphasized that the United Nations was an organization committed to furthering peace through dialogue and he expressed hope that the dialogue would be resumed soon. The existing situation was a constant threat to international peace and the ability of the international community to focus its energy and resources on the looming issues confronting it, for instance, in the fields of development, the environment, human rights, and narcotics. Also, much of the terrorist activity the world had witnessed had its roots in the conflicts in the Middle East.

10. He concluded by saying that an enlightened public opinion could bring pressure to bear to advance the peace process in the Middle East. Support for the principle of self-determination for the Palestinian people by the influential participants in the Seminar could help contribute to the mobilization of public opinion in North America. Wide support was indispensable for a just solution to the question of Palestine.

READEX FICHE

Statement by the Chairman of the Seminar

11. Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo, Chairman of the Seminar, pointed out that the meeting was being held at a time when wider support was needed from the international community, and in particular from public opinion in North America, for a just solution of the problem. Since its establishment, the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People had constantly stressed that the solution of the question of Palestine could only be envisaged through the implementation of the two-States solution. Consequently, the Committee had continued to call on Israel to respect its obligations under international law and United Nations resolutions. It also called upon the United Nations to provide all the necessary assistance to promote the economic development and prosperity of the Palestinian people. She pointed out that the persistence of the military occupation and the refusal of the Israeli Government to recognize the rights of the Palestinians had helped to ensure that the many political and diplomatic initiatives so far undertaken had remained at a stalemate. In that situation, the Committee had intensified its efforts to inform world public opinion in order to obtain greater support for the relevant United Nations resolutions. The Committee was firmly convinced that a peaceful solution required inevitably the enlightenment of public opinion and the encouragement of frank and objective discussions between all the persons concerned in order to promote a climate in which the parties could engage in a negotiating process under the auspices of the United Nations.

12. Unfortunately, however, the initiatives for peace and for the opening of dialogue adopted since 1988 by the Palestinian side had met constantly with the opposition of Israel, which had adopted a provocative attitude based on a clear desire to strengthen its illegal occupation of the Palestinan territory, where it was constantly subjecting the people to all kinds of violence, frustration and intimidation. That situation, from 9 December 1987 onwards, led to the intifadah and there was a danger of increasing recourse to violence by extremists in both camps. After recent events in the area, there was fear that a conflagration might again break out with unforeseeable consequences. The recent sudden deterioration of the situation had aroused extreme concern in the international community and had been the subject of an urgent meeting by the Security Council in Geneva. Unfortunately, the Security Council had been unable, once again, to adopt measures likely to guarantee the security and protection of the Palestinians living under occupation. That was because of the exercise of the veto by one of its permanent members.

13. At the end of the twentieth century, when the wind of freedom and democracy was blowing throughout the world, it was unacceptable that the Palestinian people should continue to be subjected to the most inhuman sufferings. The time had come to stop those injustices. The whole international community must give greater support to the objective of peace in the Middle East and must convince Israel that the Palestinians had confirmed their determination to resist and to end the Israeli occupation in order to obtain recognition of their national rights, in spite of all the difficulties. The intifadah had begun to establish the foundations for the future independent Palestinian State not only in the minds of the people but also in the way they organized their daily lives. The Committee deeply

regretted that, despite the repeated appeals of the international community, the Government of Israel had so far not responded positively to the Palestinian peace initiative or accepted the principle that the Palestinian people, like all other peoples, had inalienable national rights. Convinced that there could be no solution of the problem except through dialogue, the Committee was more than ever determined to continue its search for ways to promote such a dialogue and to bring the two parties closer together, in order to promote conditions conducive to the holding of an international peace conference. There was more and more support from many sectors of Israeli public opinion, which was far ahead of their Government in that respect. The same could be said of Jewish organizations in North America and Western Europe. Many Israelis had begun to understand that Israel must engage in a dialogue with the true representatives of the Palestinian people, namely the Palestine Liberation Organization, and consider withdrawing completely from the occupied territory, in order to allow the process of self-determination and independence to go forward. The Palestinians, including representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and Israelis, were working side by side in a number of activities, thus giving proof of their maturity and their desire to coexist peacefully in a fraternal spirit and in mutual respect. The intensification of contacts between the two sides on different levels clearly showed that a historic turning-point had been reached in that conflict and that a negotiating process was indeed possible. She concluded by saying that the influence of North American public opinion had been decisive in the successful solution of major world problems. She expressed appreciation for the sincere attachment of the peoples of North America to the ideals of peace and justice.

Message from the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization

14. A message from H.E. Mr. Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization, was read by Mr. Zuhdi L. Terzi, Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations. In the message, high appreciation was expressed for the effective role and great and important efforts of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, and for efforts of the Secretary-General as well as for the important role played by non-governmental organizations. The message stressed that the Palestinian people would continue to wage its struggle for freedom from Israeli occupation, to pursue the intifadah, and to maintain its defiance of the Israeli occupation authorities until such time as it achieved its national goals of freedom, independence and sovereignty over the soil of its homeland under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, its sole legitimate representative.

15. Referring to the new Israeli Government, the message said that in its programme there was a plan for crushing the intifadah and for the absorption and settlement of millions of Jewish immigrants. That Government treated the Palestinian people in the occupied land as strangers in their own country. Features of the programme of the Israeli governing coalition presaged the danger of a war of extermination against the Palestinian people accompanied by exercises in mass expulsion in implementation of the transfer plan embraced by the most fanatical of Israeli extremists. The message said that the new Israeli Government was a government of war against international legitimacy, the resolutions of the international community and the fundamental national rights of the Palestinian people. That Government relied on an approach based on the arrogance of power, the rejection of international legitimacy and international law and the imposition of the fait accompli by means of the murder, intimidation and expulsion of the Palestinian people in order to clear the land of its inhabitants and settle Jewish immigrants in their place prior to annexing those territories and establishing a Greater Israel. That Israeli scheme represented an open defiance of the international community and was a fundamental breach of the national rights of the Palestinian people, just as it represented a serious threat to peace and security in the region and in the world. The message cautioned the international community against the dangers posed by the Israeli Government's plan.

16. The message went on to state that today more than ever, the United States was called upon to renounce its prejudice in favour of Israeli policies of aggression and to adopt a new political stance characterized by decisiveness, even-handedness and support for Palestinian rights and in keeping with the resolutions of the international community and of international legitimacy as represented by the United Nations, including those resolutions relating to the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East as the best mechanism for ensuring the achievement of peace in the region. The message further stated that the United States Administration impeded international legitimacy by using its power to veto at the United Nations, which it had done six times that year. Without the United States support, Israel would be unable to persist in its intransigence and its rejection of peace, including the ideas and proposals put forward by the United States Administration itself. The announcement by President Bush breaking off the dialogue with the PLO was a new factor which led to increased tension in the region and gave new strength to extremism. The Palestine Liberation Organization held the United States Administration responsible for the lack of progress on the road to peace, and for any deterioration in the situation and any increase in the violence, killing and destruction.

17. The message expressed confidence that the Seminar would give serious consideration to recent developments and would adopt fitting resolutions to expose the grave dangers that would ensue from continued denial by the Israeli Government of the national rights of the Palestinian people and from continued United States support for the Israeli Government, as well as the dangers arising from the inflow of Jewish immigrants and their settlement in the occupied Palestinian land. It also expressed confidence that the Seminar would adopt appropriate resolutions to increase support and assistance to the just Palestinian cause, to the legitimate struggle of the Palestinian people for freedom and to the national uprising until such time as Israeli occupation was brought to an end and the people regained the exercise of its inalienable national rights, including the right to return, to exercise self-determination and to establish an independent Palestinian State with its capital at Jerusalem.

Other statements

18. At the opening meeting, Mr. Ricardo Alarcón de Quesada, Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; Mr. Guennadi Oudovenko, Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid; Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer of the League of Arab States; Mr. Ahmed Engin Ansay, Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference; and Mr. Count Pietersen, Chief Representative of the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania, also made statements in support of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights and for the achievement of a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the question of Palestine.

B. Panel discussion

19. Two panels were established. The panels and their panelists were as follows:

Panel I: "The role of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the economic, cultural and social development of the Palestinian people, and its political programme to achieve statehood for the Palestinian people"

Mr. Ibrahim Abu-Lughod (Palestinian)

Panel II: "The intifadah, the urgency of convening the International Peace Conference for a two peoples-two States solution, and the role of North America"

Mr. Mahdi Abdul-Hadi (Palestinian); Mr. Faisal Husseini (Palestinian); H.E. Mr. Latyr Kamara (Senegal); Mr. Amos Kenan (Israel); Mr. Hans Peter Kotthaus (Federal Republic of Germany); H.E. Mr. Michael Lanigan (Ireland); Mrs. Margaret McCormack (United States of America); Rabbi Marshall Meyer (United States of America); The Most Reverend Michael J. Peers (Canada); Mr. Chaim Shur (Israel); Mr. Andrej Zakharov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Panel I

"The role of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the economic, cultural and social development of the Palestinian people, and its political programme to achieve statehood for the Palestinian people"

20. Mr. Ibrahim Abu-Lughod, member of the Palestine National Council and Professor of Political Science at Northwestern University, stressed that the role of the Palestine Liberation Organization consisted in leading the Palestinian people towards independence. Its main function was national liberation, but it had also been engaged in the task of social, educational and cultural liberation of the Palestinian people. With reference to the statement of Mr. Nelson Mandela before the General Assembly, he emphasized that Israel did practice a similar kind of unique form of colonialism as the apartheid régime of South Africa. In its actions, the PLO had been guided by its National Charter, which called for self-determination for the Palestinian people, for national identity. Israel, especially the Zionist movement denied the identity of that people, conceiving of Palestine as a land without a people. In order to preserve and nourish the national identity, the PLO was particularly interested in the preservation of culture, and in the development of education. Examples were the growth of universities in the West Bank and Gaza as well as the establishment of a national research centre in 1965.

21. The PLO was also guided by the 1988 declaration of independence, which represented an affirmation that Palestine was a State. The most important recognition of a government came from the people themselves, not from any other government. Under the intifadah, the Palestinian people had demonstrated their acceptance of the authority of the PLO as their government, in the political, cultural and educational sense. The question that remained was the consolidation of the Palestinian sovereignty on the land without external interference. He pointed out that the intifadah had also unmasked Israel's role as an occupying Power. The Palestinian declaration of independence anchored itself in the United Nations declaration on independence for colonial countries, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and others. It was anchored also in the particular General Assembly resolutions on the Palestinian issue, which included the recognition of the right of the Palestinians to self-determination, independence, sovereignty as well as the right to return to its historic land and/or to compensation. In conclusion, he said that the United States had never accepted the Palestinians' right to self-determination, as it did not accept many peoples' right to self-determination; however, it accepted reality. Therefore, it was necessary to change reality in the region. Public opinion in the United States was in favour of the exercise by the Palestinian people of its sovereignty. Israel would be defeated as a colonial power. It had to be demonstrated to Israel that the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized improved after decolonization. It was always up to the colonized to break the impasse. It was the Palestinians who had offered coexistence with the Jewish community in Palestine. The form was a two-States solution in which both States and both peoples would be equal and in which both peoples would co-operate.

Panel II

"The intifadah, the urgency of convening the International Peace Conference for a two peoples - two States solution, and the role of North America"

22. Mr. Faisal Husseini, a Palestinian and Director of the Arab Studies Centre in East Jerusalem, said that in order to achieve peace and to bring an end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, both sides should set aside their dreams and their concerns. Each side should identify who was the enemy, the essence of that enemy, and whether there could be coexistence. For the Palestinians, they assessed that Israel was the enemy. They had decided to coexist with that enemy and they were willing to sit down and to negotiate with it. And they had to negotiate with its leadership, whether they liked or hated it, because only with that leadership could peace be achieved. Israel should also identify its enemy, determine its position towards him and sit down with the representatives of that people. A future security system should not be built on a balance of power, which meant a balance of power and fear, but on mutual interest. He emphasized that there was much common ground between Israel and Palestine as well as between Israel and Jordan.

23. Referring to the intifadah, he said that it had great implications. The clear message was that the Palestinians did not want to destroy the State of Israel, but wanted to put an end to occupation. There was no way to maintain that occupation. The intifadah was a movement, a kind of a revolution towards changing the thinking. It was a war to change public opinion. The battle was being waged on four fronts, the Palestinian, the Israeli, the international and the Arab front. The first year of the uprising was dominated by an internal Palestinian battle and culminated in the decisions of the Palestine National Council in November 1988. On the international front much had been achieved especially in Europe. In the third year of the intifadah, the battle was being waged on the front of Israeli public opinion. It was already not possible for Israel to maintain the occupation on the basis of a complete national consensus. It had led to the collapse of the coalition Government and strengthened internal opposition to the occupation. It was necessary to consolidate the intifadah by reviving and escalating it. The goal would be the establishment of the infrastructure for the Palestinian State, the separation of Palestinian interests and Palestinian agencies from the Israeli State agencies and the separation of the Palestinian economy from the Israeli economy. He pointed out that the ultimate aim of establishing a Palestinian State was to achieve a comprehensive peace in the Middle East region. That peace would not be attained through a separate Palestinian-Israeli agreement but rather through a comprehensive Arab-Israeli agreement that was endorsed and guaranteed by an international conference and the big powers. The fight for a Palestinian State was not for creating a new economy, but because that was the only solution for the problem of the Palestinian people. Through the creation of a Palestinian State the door could be opened for regional co-operation in the Middle East. He emphasized that, today for the first time, there was no national consensus inside Israel to support the occupation. Also there was no consensus within the Jewish community inside the United States to support Israel whether it was right or wrong. Now, therefore, was the time for the Palestinian people to continue to strive, within the framework of international law. American public opinion should be influenced through concerted action by Arab and Jewish communities in that country.

24. Mr. Mahdi Abdul Hadi, President of the Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs, pointed out that the intifadah had given a reinforced sense of national identity to the Palestinian people in the occupied territory. The Israeli policy had been to maintain the status quo and to contain the intifadah in its limited geographical borders. It was therefore important for the international community to monitor the Israeli practices in the occupied territory in a serious and systematic manner. The international community should also strengthen its presence there through its various agencies. Such agencies should play an eyewitness role with regard to Israeli practices and inform public opinion, in order to ensure that the international community would act to stop those practices and to bring Israel to the negotiating table together with the PLO, within the framework of the International Peace Conference, which was the only venue to guarantee peace, security and stability for all States and peoples in the region. He said that the intifadah was built on two major elements. During the first year of the intifadah people succeeded in building the national consensus, whose expression was the political programme for a two-States solution. The second year brought the PLO international recognition. The main task for the third year was to influence Israeli public opinion. But now, with the new Israeli Government, the fears came back, because there was no peace process any more. He referred to the question of Jerusalem and stressed that the Palestinians wanted to see it as one open city, but two capitals and two sovereignities. With reference to the Jewish emigrants from the Soviet Union, he stated that the Palestinians were not against the right of anybody to leave his or her own country and to return, but that should be applied to both Palestinians and Jews as well. He called on Eastern and Western Europe as well as the United States and Australia to open their doors to those emigrants. Any immigration to Israel should not be at the expense of the Palestinians in terms of land, work, water and rights. Any attempts to settle those emigrants in the occupied territory would escalate the confrontation.

25. H.E. Mr. Latyr Kamara, Honorary Ambassador from Senegal, said that the hope of seeing the start of true negotiations on the burning question of Palestine seemed to have been dashed when Shimon Peres, head of the Israeli Labour Party, was defeated in forming a majority Government in Israel. At the same time, the violence and the extent of repression taking place in the occupied Palestinian territories were appalling. Israel's clear refusal of peace may well pave the way for war. He stressed that a possible solution did exist, which had been worked out long ago and had been the object of international consensus. It was universally felt that its acceptance by Israel ought to allow elections in the occupied territories, then Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, and finally the organization of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, in compliance with General Assembly resolution 181 (II), which provides for a two peoples-two States solution. The United States and Israel were responsible for the obstacles that prevented the International Peace Conference from being held. After all efforts made by the United Nations, new strategies of all kinds must be devised, that would bring pressures, sanctions and attempts at persuasion to bear on those two countries, on their public opinion, and on the Jewish community of the United States.

26. He stressed the immediate need for starting the peace process and for defining the direction of the actions to be taken. The intifadah, a major element in such strategies that already encompassed the Israeli Arabs, must be encouraged and supported and the unbelievable sacrifices made should make the front page of the newspapers. The justice of what was behind it must come to prevail. Concomitant diplomatic activities that must not discount any aspect would also be undertaken. The momentous events which had already swept away or shaken many systems that had denied human rights and the dignity of peoples had dynamics that would do the rest. The basic question - Will the question of Palestine and the illegal occupation of the Arab territories continue to elude the dialectics of the new East-West détente? - must be answered in the negative. The delaying tactics currently being practised by the Israeli Government could not go on indefinitely and would finally be thwarted by the forces of peace in the world.

27. Mr. Amos Kenan, writer and journalist from Israel, said that the children of the intifadah were fighting also that war to liberate Israel from the occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. He stressed that in Israel today there was a decline of the judicial system, of health and welfare services, of education and economy. Israel could not afford that decline without massive help from the United States. Israel was given that money for different reasons, historical, humanistic, but also as a political bribe. He said that the three most obstinate historical enemies of Israel declared today openly that they wanted to make peace with Israel: the PLO, Iraq and Syria. Nevertheless, the Syrian or Iraqi danger continued to be an often used cliché to prove the assertion that for security reasons, Israel could not make peace with them. But Israel had every interest and every possibility to make peace today. He emphasized that there was no serious factor today in the Arab world that would not make peace with Israel. He expressed the view that Israelis and Palestinians were like twins, they had lived for one century on the same soil and they loved the same place. Peace was in the interest of both of them. Israel could not push the Palestinians or the Arabs forever. He referred to the activities of the United Nations to educate public opinion on the Middle East conflict in different regions of the world and said that the only decisive arena for the battle for peace was in the United States, especially its Jewish community. The Jewish community in the United States should be convinced of the necessity of immediate peace with the Palestinians and the recognition of the human rights of the Palestinians including the right of self-determination. Although there was a gap between public opinion and official policy in the United States, public opinion was documented by the media, and people like him did not have access to the American media. He quoted from a commentary he had written after the recent tragic incidents in Israel and which had been rejected for publication by several newspapers in the United States. In Israel, he said, he could publish it in any newspaper. He concluded by proposing that the United Nations Secretariat should employ especially one Jewish Israeli and one Arab Israeli, who would try to contact the Jewish community in the United States to establish a dialogue. Without a dialogue between Israelis, Palestinians and Diaspora Jews there would be no peace in the region.

28. Mr. Hans Peter Kotthaus (Federal Republic of Germany), Secretary-General of the Parliamentary Association for Euro-Arab Co-operation, stressed that Europe, and in particular the European Community, had to make its contributions towards the peace process in the Middle East. Europe was a direct neighbour of the region and the most important economic partner of both Israel and the Arab world. In their Middle East policy the United States and Europe should give high priority to the support of the forces on both sides which strove for a political settlement. The time had come for the United States to initiate a comprehensive peaceful settlement, which was inseparable from the creation of a Palestinian State and setting the borders between the two States. By suspending the dialogue with the PLO, the United States was rewarding the extremist group, which had initiated the massacre. Such a step played into the hands of the rejectionists on both sides. It would also weaken the political position of the moderate PLO leadership. The European Community should do its utmost to persuade the United States to resume the dialogue and to urge it to intensify its peace efforts. There was also the problem of Soviet Jewish immigration to Israel, he continued. Inalienable human rights, such as the right to freedom of movement, had their limitations when the human rights of other peoples were involved. He shared the United States' concern about the danger of the growing arms race in the Middle East region, and said the United States and the European Community had key roles to play in the peace process. A negotiated settlement resulting in self-determination for both Israel and Palestine had to be reached.

29. Mr. Michael Lanigan, Senator from Ireland, expressed concern at the lack of European involvement in meetings such as the current Seminar. Most support for the Palestinian cause came from countries which were not in a position to do much about the problem. He said that people did not forget their roots, and those who sought to deny the rights of the Palestinian people should keep that in mind. Western Europe had played a major role in the Middle East through its colonial aspirations and intrusions. Ireland was one of the few European countries which had not been a colonial Power in the region and might therefore be able to serve as a broker in the dispute. With reference to the results of the local elections in Algeria, he expressed the view that the victory of militant Islam in that country would be only a starting point of turmoil throughout the Middle East. He pointed out that Israel was a signatory to the Fourth Geneva Convention and its violations of international law in the occupied territories had to be addressed. Israel's co-signatories had not protected the Palestinian people's rights. Israel had failed to comply with the Geneva Convention in such areas as education and health. It had used violence and excessive force against peaceful demonstrations and permitted the use of firearms in such situations. Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories was essential to a peaceful settlement. Every signatory to the Geneva Convention should be called upon to fight for its enforcement in the occupied territories. In conclusion, he stressed that the State of Israel had the right to exist, but equally important was the recognition of the rights of the Palestinians. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People should become a catalyst for discussion and should try to extend its influence more into the Western countries.

30. Mrs. Margaret McCormack, a political consultant from the United States, said she had spent 20 years working to influence American politics. The United States was engaged in a propaganda move to use "terrorism" as an excuse for military action. Peace activists had prevented the use of the terror game to justify military intervention in the Middle East, but the United States had seized its first opportunity to break off talks with the PLO. With an election coming soon, she expected American foreign policy on the Middle East question to be one of "benign neglect". She stressed that the United States continued to be the single most important force for bringing the parties to the Middle East conflict to a peace conference. The political work must be directed towards the United States Government through the superstructure, which was well organized and consisted of business, education, press, religion, the military, labour, culture and politics. Mobilizing the base of the society, she said, could be effective only if those groups were organized in blocks of voters or visibly organized within the superstructure. It was important to work continuously and directly to build the coalition between African-Americans and Palestinians. She stressed that it was more effective to mobilize the superstructure and not the base, because it would not be possible to organize the base in sufficient numbers to influence voting results. The elected officials would visit Palestinian leaders if the trips were subsidized and the most effective lobbying could be undertaken by taking Congress members to the West Bank and Gaza and to the leadership of the Palestinian movement. Further, the relationship between the domestic struggles for Palestinian statehood and the solidarity movements for national liberation in South Africa and Central America was becoming increasingly important. She concluded by saying that everything was political: arts, music, culture, education, religion, business, sports, work; and one should not pass up any opportunity but make every opportunity work to influence the State.

31. Rabbi Marshall Meyer of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun in Manhattan, New York, said that he was missing in the discussion a rhetoric leading to peace. Instead, there was a strange dealing with history. He stated that he believed in a two-States solution to the problem and that he had fought for the recognition of Palestinian rights. For that, the intifadah was a very important instrument. He stressed the urgency of convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East for the two peoples - two States solution. To achieve that goal there was a role to be played by North America, Europe and the European Community and the Soviet Union. He disagreed totally with the policies of the occupation of the territories and he considered the West Bank and Gaza as occupied territories. He said that he was a Zionist but he was against occupation and inhuman treatment of the Palestinians. Zionism was not a form of racism, but a liberation movement of the Jewish people, just as the Palestine Liberation Organization was a liberation movement for Palestinians. With reference to the statement of Mr. Faisal Husseini, a Palestinian, he stressed that the latter had presented a constructive programme. Both parties had to give up stupid past dreams and cliché discussions of the past. They had to get off ideology and disputes over history because everybody would read history according to his or her own particular discipline. History is a subjective study. He stressed that there could no longer be a Greater Israel dream and called for the implementation of the "land for peace" formula by Israel. There must be

autonomy for the Palestinian people and also elections. It was imperative to stop the bloodshed. Human life was a sacred gift which nobody had the right to take. The parties should stop talking so much about the past and talk about the possibility of what to do now so as to ensure the possibility of a future.

32. Archbishop Michael J. Peers, Archbishop and Primate of the Anglican Church of Canada, stressed that he was speaking as a Christian and a North American. He said that there were Muslims, Christians and Jews on that continent who felt a moral obligation to the cause of peace and justice in the Middle East. However, North American involvement had not always been helpful. Decisions affecting the lives of people in the region were often made in North America on the basis of self-interest. He emphasized that the intifadah was primarily a non-violent movement of the Palestinian people. Its causes were complex and lay outside the region, among the international community, as well as within. The West had tended to submerge the Palestinian question within the larger issue of Arab-Jewish hostilities, and the result had been serious crises for the Palestinians, and now for Israel and the world itself. It was now the time to convene an international peace conference. The Churches of the Middle East, as well as those of Canada and the United States, would support such an initiative. The conflict could not be resolved by force. Christians had much to repent of their history in relation to Jewish people. But they could not be silent today in the face of Palestinian suffering. People of faith and good will must be ready to support a meaningful dialogue among the principal parties in the conflict.

33. Mr. Chaim Shur, Israeli writer and Editor-in-Chief of the Middle East magazine New-Outlook, stated that he accepted the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination which should be expressed in the establishment of a Palestinian State. The Palestine Liberation Organization should be regarded as the sole representative of the Palestinians. Israel should withdraw to the 1967 borders. Referring to the question of Jerusalem, he said there were three aspects: religious, municipal and political. All religions should be equally respected and the city should have Jewish and Palestinian boroughs. But the essence of the political problem was that Jerusalem should consist of two capital cities: one part should be the capital of Israel and the other part the capital of Palestine. He added that the right of return should be equally granted to both Palestinians and Israelis. The Palestinians should have the right of return to the Palestinian State and the Jews should have the right of return to the State of Israel. However, very few Israelis agreed to that compromise, and even fewer would agree with recognition of the Palestinian State. In his view, a dialogue, not a monologue, should be conducted. He said he was against the Jews settling on the West Bank, whether they were Jews from the Soviet Union or from Brooklyn. In fact, he was against Jewish settlement in the occupied territories as such. Viewing the issue from that angle, Jewish immigration to Israel was not a problem. In his opinion, it was not immigration, but settlement in the occupied territories that mattered, he stressed. He, himself, was very proud of being a Jew. Though no people was perfect he was proud of Jewish history, and proud of the culture and achievements of Jewish people. Unfortunately, the history of Jewish people was a sad one, being full of pogroms. Though perestroika and glasnost had done many positve things, it had also given rise to "Pamyat", an anti-semite movement. Many Jews emigrated from the Soviet Union not because they were Zionist, but because they were afraid of anti-semitism. He

understood zionism primarily as the right of Jews to self-determination, he said. In conclusion, he called for a settlement that would result in self-determination and security for Israel and Palestine.

34. Mr. Andrej Zakharov, member of the Presidium of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, stressed that the Middle East was still a dangerous seat of tension, creating a serious threat to world peace, security and stability. He emphasized that the radical changes in the world arena were objectively creating favourable external conditions for settling the conflict. The intifadah had given one of the most important impulses for finding a fair solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. He noted that while the Israeli authorities were escalating reprisals against the Palestinians, the intifadah was employing essentially peaceful, non-violent methods, displaying self-control and self-possession. From the outset, the uprising had been led by the Palestine Liberation Organization, which had buttressed its international prestige. He stressed that the PLO had displayed a responsible and constructive approach to the problems of a settlement of the Middle East conflict. It would be unfair to refuse to deal with the PLO and to deny it the right to participate in the peace process. Recently, the threat of a new escalation of tension had arisen. The situation was gravely complicated by the intention of the Israeli Government to settle emigrants, including those from the Soviet Union, on captured Arab territories. The Soviet Union was taking steps on that score through the United Nations and through bilateral channels, working for an effective barrier to Israel's expansionist plans, so that within the framework of the implementation of universally acknowledged human rights, including freedom of emigration, the legitimate Arab rights should not be prejudiced. He said that the absence of an Arab-Israeli settlement was fraught with a special danger, because of the ongoing intensive arms race, weapons of mass destruction and missile systems. A settlement must be comprehensive and embrace the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, the realization of the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people and security guarantees for all the Middle East countries, including Israel. Only a carefully considered international system of security guarantees for all sides could put an end to the concerns of Israelis and Arabs. The system of guarantees must be up to the highest standards, providing for requisite measures in the event the agreements were breached, for mutual inspections and on-site verifications, for fully demilitarized zones, and also for curtailed military presence. More active use should be made of the possibilities of the United Nations and its Security Council. It was necessary to work for a turn from over-arming to the principle of sensible sufficiency for defence. He proposed a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass annihilation. He urged that the United States should exercise appropriate influence on Israeli policy. The decision of the United States Administration to suspend the dialogue with the PLO could create additional difficulties for the negotiation process and encourage Israel to carry on its obstructionist policy.

C. Conclusions and recommendations

35. The participants expressed appreciation once again for the opportunity to have a full and candid discussion of aspects of the question of Palestine and the Arab-Israeli conflict under the auspices of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. They expressed satisfaction that the Seminar had made a positive contribution to the peace process by providing a forum for a balanced and constructive discussion of the issues.

36. The participants reaffirmed the view that negotiations based on the "two peoples, two States" principle which adequately addressed the rights and concerns of both the Israelis and Palestinians would result in peace and justice in the region, as envisaged in General Assembly resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III). Statements were made indicating that important sectors of the Israeli public have become active in support of the "two State" solution. Appreciation was expressed for the position adopted by a large number of Governments and NGOs in response to the proclamation of the State of Palestine, the Palestinian Arab State, to exist side by side with the State of Israel. The participants urged that negotiations should be based on the "land for peace" formula embodied in Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which provided a foundation for an eventual settlement, and the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people, including primarily the right to self-determination.

37. They noted the adoption of General Assembly resolution 44/42 of 6 December 1989 and were encouraged by the overwhelming vote in favour of that balanced and comprehensive resolution which, for the first time, was supported by all members of the European Community. The resolution reaffirmed the necessity of convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East under the auspices of the United Nations with the participation of all parties to the conflict, including the PLO and the five permanent members of the Security Council. Regret was expressed that to date there had been no progress in that regard. The PLO had explicitly accepted those resolutions whereas some recent statements on the part of the newly formed Government of Israel seemed to cast doubt on its adherence to Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

38. Participants expressed deep concern at the continued loss of life in the occupied territories and at the continued violations by Israel of the human rights of the civilian population in the occupied Palestinian territory. The international community had repeatedly declared that the Israeli policies and practices in the occupied Palestinian territory were in violation of its obligations as a party to the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and contrary to United Nations resolutions and generally recognized norms of international law. The participants appealed to the parties to the Convention to ensure respect for its provisions. They deplored recent statements by the Israeli Government implying the prospect of increased settlement of immigrants in the occupied Palestinian territory, while Israel continued to deny Palestinians the right to return to their homes. The participants supported the right of freedom of movement and the right of everyone to leave any country and the right to return to one's own country. However, those rights could not be used as a pretext to settle immigrants or Israeli civilians in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem. They urged the Security Council to prevent such illegal settlements.

39. Participants viewed with grave concern the tragic incidents which had taken place recently in Israel and in the occupied Palestinian territory. They deplored the attack in Israel on the Palestinian workers from Gaza leading to 7 deaths and 10 wounded, which sparked demonstrations throughout the occupied territories that resulted in 7 additional Palestinian deaths by Israeli army gunfire, and in the wounding of hundreds of others. Further, the participants expressed their concern over the recent incursion of the Israeli Defence Forces in the UNRWA Health Centre in Gaza

town in which many civilians and, in particular, infants and young children, were injured. At the same time, participants expressed deep concern at the aborted raid on Tel Aviv beaches by Palestinian guerrillas and noted that the Palestine Liberation Organization disassociated itself from that attack.

40. The participants supported the intifadah and the Palestinian peace initiative of November 1988 as efforts by the Palestinian people in its struggle to attain and exercise its inalienable rights. The participants considered that the steps proposed by the Israeli Government on 14 May 1989 were inadequate, since they did not include interim measures of protection for the Palestinian people nor other measures which would enable the Palestinians to fully exercise their right to self-determination. It was noted that the intifadah had far-reaching implications, which included effects on aspects of Israeli politics. Specifically, it had led to a major government crisis and helped the forces working for a just peace to engage in dialogue and joint activities with the Palestinians as a way to promote mutual understanding. They agreed that the United Nations should continue to offer its good offices and organize activities to bring together Palestinians and Israelis under its auspices. Participants appealed to all Governments with influence, including the United States, Western European countries, Israel and the Palestinians to pursue more vigorous efforts towards a fair and just solution to the Middle East dispute.

41. Participants appealed to the Security Council to assume and discharge its responsibilities and to take urgent measures to ensure the physical protection and to guarantee the safety and security of the Palestinian people under Israeli occupation, including prevention of deportation of Palestinians which had been repeatedly condemned by the Security Council and General Assembly. They urged the Security Council, particularly its permanent members, to undertake every effort to facilitate the convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East and to adopt interim measures including the deployment of a United Nations force to safeguard the physical security of the people of the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem.

42. The participants noted with appreciation that the Secretary-General had taken the initiative to send a Personal Representative to Israel and the occupied territories to look into the situation and report back to him. The participants expressed appreciation for the Secretary-General's continuing endeavours to advance the peace process and to facilitate the convening of the International Peace Conference.

43. The participants called upon the Committee to ensure that United Nations regional seminars on the question of Palestine provided an opportunity for diverse points of views to be expressed so that a meaningful dialogue could be held among people of good will on all sides. Satisfaction was expressed with the constructive and frank exchange which had taken place at that seminar between the Israeli and Palestinian participants, as well as nationals of other countries including those of Jewish faith. It was noted, however, that while Palestinians representing the PLO had participated, the Government of Israel had yet to agree to be represented in such forums. The hope was expressed that the Government of Israel would be represented at future meetings. Participants suggested that future seminars and NGO symposia related to the question of Palestine should consider some of the substantive issues which needed to be addressed.

44. Participants called on all countries and particularly the United States and other Western countries to support the Committee's activities and its objective of expanding dialogue among opinion shapers and responsible political leaders. Those Governments as well as other United Nations Members were urged to participate in the work of the Committee as members or observers. The participants expressed the view that the Committee could make a significant contribution through the convening of seminars and symposia to widen the exchange of views ultimately leading to areas of common approval. It was noted with concern that the United States Government had, for the present, suspended its dialogue with the Palestine Liberation Organization. Participants considered that that action constituted a serious set-back for the peace process. The participants expressed the hope that the dialogue would be re-established as soon as possible and its scope expanded to include the consideration in a constructive manner of substantive issues so as to enhance the process of negotiations leading to a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine. Adversaries must speak together if peace was to be achieved.

Annex I

MESSAGE FROM THE PARTICIPANTS TO H.E. MR. YASSER ARAFAT, CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION

We, the participants in the Seventh United Nations North American Regional Seminar on the Question of Palestine and the Seventh United Nations North American Regional NGO Symposium on the Question of Palestine wish to express our appreciation for your gracious message of support conveyed to the Seminar and to the Symposium by Mr. Zuhdi L. Terzi, Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations.

We take this opportunity to express our support for your extraordinary efforts to open a substantive dialogue for peace in the Middle East.

We reaffirm our solid support for the struggle of the Palestinian people to exercise its legitimate and inalienable national rights, as dramatically demonstrated over the past two and a half years in the intifadah in the occupied Palestinian territory. We salute the historic Palestinian peace initiative launched by the nineteenth extraordinary session of the Palestine National Council, held at Algiers from 12 to 15 November 1988, as a bold and significant contribution towards the achievement of peace in the Middle East.

We have noted with concern that the United States Government has for the present, suspended its dialogue with the Palestine Liberation Organization. We consider this action as a serious set-back for the peace process. We hope that the dialogue will be re-established as soon as possible and its scope expanded to include the consideration in a constructive manner of substantive issues so as to enhance the process of negotiations leading to a just and lasting solution to the question of Palestine.

We sincerely hope that the results of the Seminar and the Symposium will contribute positively to the achievement of a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, of which the question of Palestine is the core. We reaffirm our unconditional commitment to support the people of Palestine until the full realization of an independent and sovereign Palestinian State is achieved.

We regard the significant results achieved at the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly and in particular the adoption of General Assembly resolution 44/42 of 6 December 1989, which reaffirms the provisions of General Assembly resolution 43/176 of 15 December 1988 as a demonstration of the emerging international consensus of the necessity of convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East and express our genuine support for the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his endeavours aimed at early realization of this objective as demanded by the international community.

Annex II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Panelists

Mr. Mahdi Abdul-Hadi (Palestinian)

Mr. Ibrahim Abu-Lughod (Palestinian)

Mr. Faisal Husseini (Palestinian)

H.E. Mr. Latyr Kamara (Senegal)

Mr. Amos Kenan (Israel)

Mr. Hans Peter Kotthaus (Federal Republic of Germany)

Mr. Michael Lanigan (Ireland)

Mrs. Margaret McCormack (United States of America)

Rabbi Marshall Meyer (United States of America)

The Most Rev. Michael G. Peers (Canada)

Mr. Chaim Shur (Israel)

Mr. Andrej Zakharov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)

Representative of the Secretary-General

Mr. Ronald I. Spiers
Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs and Secretariat Services

Member States

Afghanistan	Mr. Mohammad Roshan-Rawaan Minister Counsellor
	Mr. Mohauddin Taeb First Secretary
Argentina	Mr. Estanislao A. Zawels Secretary of Embassy

Bahamas	H.E. Mr. James B. Moultrie Permanent Representative
	Mr. Peter Deveaux-Isaacs First Secretary
	Ms. Keva L. Bain Second Secretary
Bulgaria	Mr. Ivan Sotirov Acting Permanent Representative
Burkina Faso	H.E. Mr. Gaëtan R. Ouedraogo Permanent Representative
	Mr. Ambroise Silga Second Counsellor
	Ms. Awa Ouedraogo Counsellor
Chile	Mr. Konrad Paulsen First Secretary
	Mr. Julio Fiol Third Secretary
China	Mr. Yu Shuning First Secretary
Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. Djabia Joachim Anviré Counsellor
Cuba	H.E. Mr. Ricardo Alarcón de Quesada Permanent Representative
	Mr. René J. Mujica Minister Counsellor
	Mrs. Rosa L. Mujica
Cyprus	Mr. Petros Eftychiou Deputy Permanent Representative
	Mr. Elias Eliades Counsellor
	Mr. James C. Droushiotis First Secretary

Ecuador	Mrs. Jenny Almeida de Ribadeneira Counsellor
Egypt	H.E. Mr. Amre M. Moussa Permanent Representative
	Mr. Mohamed Assem Ibrahim Assem Counsellor
	Mr. Mohamed Nabil Fahmy Counsellor
German Democratic Republic	Mr. Dirk Hielscher Second Secretary
Guyana	H.E. Mr. S.R. Insanally Permanent Representative
	Mr. Earl Manget First Secretary
Hungary	Mr. Ferenc Abrahám First Secretary
India	Mr. Dinesh Kumar Jain Counsellor
Indonesia	H.E. Mr. Nana Sutresna Permanent Representative
	H.E. Mr. Nugroho Wisnumurti Deputy Permanent Representative
	Mr. Abdul Nasier Counsellor
	Mr. Kristio Wahyono Third Secretary
Ireland	Mr. John O. Burke Chargé d'Affaires, a.i.
	Mr. Kevin Francis Conmy Second Secretary
Jamaica	Mr. Dennis Ivanhoe Francis Counsellor
Jordan	Mr. Ibrahim Awawdeh Second Secretary

Liberia	Mr. Konah K. Blackett Minister Counsellor
	Mr. Moses Y. Harris Second Secretary
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Omar R. Jelban First Secretary
Malaysia	Mr. Kamal Yan Yahaya First Secretary
	Mr. Zainal Abidin Ahmad Second Secretary
Mali	Mr. Cheick Sidi Ahmed Tidiane Diarra First Counsellor
Malta	H.E. Mr. Alexander Borg Olivier Permanent Representative
Mauritania	Mr. Kharass Kane First Counsellor
Mauritius	H.E. Mr. Satteeanund Peerthum Permanent Representative
	Mr. Patrice Cure First Secretary
Mexico	Mr. Abraham Montes de Oca Counsellor
Morocco	Mr. M'Hammed Chafik El Khatib Counsellor
Nicaragua	Mrs. Grethel Vargas First Secretary
Nigeria	Mr. Oseloka H. Obaze Second Secretary
Peru	Mr. Julio Garro Second Secretary
Qatar	Mr. Alkhulaifi Abdulrahman First Secretary
Romania	Mr. Nicolae Micu Deputy Permanent Representative
	Mr. Ioan N. Voicu Minister Counsellor

Rwanda	Mr. Chaste Abimana First Counsellor
Saudi Arabia	Mr. Mansour Al-Saud Second Secretary
Senegal	H.E. Mrs. Absa Claude Diallo Permanent Representative
	Mr. Mame Balla Sy First Counsellor
Sierra Leone	H.E. Mr. Tom Obaleh Kargbo Permanent Representative
	Mr. Thomason D. Lawson First Secretary
Sudan	H.E. Mr. Salah Mohamed Ali Deputy Permanent Representative
	Mr. Abbas Ahmed ElNour El Gereifawi First Secretary
Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Mohammad Adib Khani Counsellor
Tunisia	Ms. Holla Bachtobji First Secretary
	Mrs. Alice Benlamine First Secretary
Turkey	H.E. Mr. Mustafa Aksin Permanent Representative
	Mr. Ahmet Acet Counsellor
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	Mr. Nikolai P. Makarevytch Deputy Permanent Representative
	Mr. Nikolai N. Kirichenko First Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. Vladimir Khanjenkov Expert, International Organizations Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Viet Nam	H.E. Mr. Nguyen Can Deputy Permanent Representative
	Ms. Dinh Thi Minh Huyen Counsellor

Yemen	Mr. Ahmed Ali Alakwaa Minister Plenipotentiary
Yugoslavia	H.E. Mr. Dragoslav Pejic Permanent Representative
	Mr. Misislav Paic Counsellor

Non-member States represented by observers

Holy See	Archbishop Renato R. Martino
	Rev. David A. Caroll

United Nations organs

Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

H.E. Mr. Ricardo Alarcón de Quesada (Cuba)

Special Committee against Apartheid

H.E. Mr. Guennadi I. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)

United Nations specialized agencies

ILO	Mr. Georges Minet Deputy Director
	Mr. William Knight Public Information Officer
	Mr. Z. Chichioco
UNESCO	Mrs. Neh Dukuly-Tolbert Senior Liaison Officer Liaison Office with the United Nations
	Mr. D. Harold Fruchtbaum Consultant
UNIDO	Mr. Hassan Bahlouli Deputy Director
	Ms. Aurora Rodriguez Information Officer

WHO	Mr. Chin-Min Lee Principal External Relations Officer Liaison Office with the United Nations

United Nations bodies

UNCHS (HABITAT)	Ms. Aliye Celik Liaison Officer Human Settlements Officer
	Mr. Victor Lee
UNHCR	Mr. Assane Samb Representative at the United Nations
	Mr. Santiago Romero Pérez Deputy Representative
UNICEF	Ms. R. Padmini Chief Middle East and North Africa Section
	Ms. Maie Ayoub Programme Officer Middle East and North Africa Section

Intergovernmental organizations having received a standing invitation to participate in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly as observers

Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee	H.E. Mr. Bhagwat-Singh Permanent Observer
League of Arab States	H.E. Mr. Clovis Maksoud Permanent Observer
	Mr. Abdul Ismail Deputy Permanent Observer
	Mr. Hassan Osman Abdeldaim Attaché
	Mr. Mohamed Morsi Attaché

Organization of the Islamic Conference	H.E. Mr. Ahmet Engin Ansay Permanent Observer
	Ms. Yaye Samb Administrative Attaché

Other organizations having received a standing invitation to participate in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly as observers

Palestine	Mr. Zuhdi L. Terzi Permanent Observer
	Dr. M. Nasser Al-Kidwa Alternate Permanent Observer
	Dr. Riyad H. Mansour Deputy Permanent Observer
	Mrs. Maha Giacaman Khoury Counsellor

National liberation movements recognized by the Organization of African Unity

Pan Africanist Congress of Azania	Mr. Count Pietersen Chief Representative
	Mr. Moshe Msinnga

Non-governmental organizations

American Jewish Alternatives to Zionism

Arab-Palestine Association

Christian Peace Conference

Church of Humanism

Friends of New Outlook

Grassroots International

Middle East Institute

Mobilization for Survival

United Holy Land Fund

United Methodist Church

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

World Peace Council

Co-ordinating Committees for NGOs on the Question of Palestine:

Asian Co-ordinating Committee for NGOs on the Question of Palestine

European Co-ordinating Committee for NGOs on the Question of Palestine

International Co-ordinating Committee for NGOs on the Question of Palestine

---